Customer No. : 31561
Application No.: 10/605,080
Docket No. : 11221-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Advisory Action stated that the previous remarks for the Final Office Action are not understood and not seen to be consistent with Applicant's own invention. However, the Applicants stated the technique of Cited References in the previous Response and therefore it is different from the present application. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and make a detailed discussion below. Reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131. However, Min did not teach the technique feature of "a first phase internal voltage generator for providing a first internal voltage source upon receiving an external voltage source, a second phase internal voltage generator ... consumes relatively lower power than the first phase internal voltage generator; wherein as the second internal voltage source ... is steadied, the first internal voltage source ... is cut off thereby" as claimed in claim 1 of the present application.

More specifically, Min teaches that the main circuit 20 is cut off when the internal voltage exceeds a predetermined value that makes the state signal be in high level state

Customer No. : 31561
Application No.: 10/605,080
Docket No. : 11221-US-PA

(According to Col. 4, lines 3-5, "*By contrast, when the internal voltage rises, the state signal divided by the resistors R1 and R2 is in a high level state and it is inverted to a low level state by the inverter I9*"). However, **the fact that the internal voltage rises does not imply that the sub circuit 10 is steadied**.

Further, **Min** teaches that the main circuit 20 is cut off because it is in the stand-by mode, but not because the sub circuit 10 is steadied (According to Col.4, lines 16-20, "*... in the case of the stand-by mode, the only sub circuit 10 acts to provide the supply voltage VOUT ... while in the case of the starting power supply, both the sub circuit 10 and the main circuit 20 act to provide the voltage VOUT*"). However, **the fact that the circuit is in the stand-by mode does not imply that the sub circuit 10 is steadied**.

Accordingly, thoroughly in Min, it did not teach the technique feature of "**as the second internal voltage source ... is steadied, the first internal voltage source ... is cut off thereby**" as claimed in claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, Min did not teach each and every element of the claim 1, and did not anticipate claim 1 as well.

The Advisory Action stated that "... while the output voltage is considered steadied, it will necessarily have a small range of variation due to offset values and other factors of the circuit. In this same way, the reference to Min uses negative feedback to control the output voltage ...". The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for reasons set forth below.

As stated by the Advisory Action, Min uses negative feedback to control the output voltage. However, as described above, Min cuts off the main circuit when voltage provided by

the sub circuit rises (and specifically, rises to above a predetermined value). Min did not teach that the voltage provided by the sub circuit is kept steadied (with a small range of variation, of course) at the predetermined voltage that forces the main circuit to be cutoff. Accordingly, even Min uses negative feedback to control the output voltage, it does not teach the technique feature of "as the second internal voltage source ... is steadied, the first internal voltage source ... is cut off thereby" as claimed in claim 1 of the present application.

Accordingly, Min did not anticipate claim 1, and claim 1 is patentable over Min. Claims 2-3 and 5-7 are therefore patentable over Min as a matter of law.

For at least the same reason, Min did not anticipate claim 8 since Min did not teach the technique feature of "the first internal voltage source, supplied by the first phase internal voltage generator, being cut off when the second internal voltage source is steadied." as claimed in claim 8.

Accordingly, Min did not anticipate claim 8, and claim 8 is patentable over Min. Claims 9 and 10 are therefore patentable over Min as a matter of law.

The Office Action further rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yabe. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131. However, Yabe did not teach the technique feature of "as the second internal

voltage source ... is steadied, the first internal voltage source ... is cut off thereby" as claimed in claim 1. More specifically, as taught by line 50, column 6 to line 6, column 7 in **Yabe**, "*... the standby control signal STBY is at the low level in the operating state, and then the operating power supply voltage step down circuit 1 supplies the high internal power supply voltage VDDint to the internal power supply line IPL ... In the operating state, the standby power supply voltage step down circuit 2 also supplies the low internal power supply voltage VDDint to the internal power supply line IPL ... In the standby state, the standby control signal STBY is at the high level, and then the operating power supply voltage step down circuit 1 does not supply the high internal power supply voltage VDDint to the internal power supply line IPL. As a result of this, the voltage of the internal power supply line IPL remains at the low internal power supply voltage VDDint supplied by the standby power supply voltage step down circuit 2.*"

Accordingly, Yabe makes the standby power supply voltage step down circuit 2 always maintain its output as low internal power supply voltage VDDint, and *the operating power supply voltage step down circuit 1 is cut off according to the STBY signal but not cut off simply when the low internal power supply voltage is steadied*.

Accordingly, **Yabe did not teach to cut off circuit 1 when output of circuit 2 is steadied**. Therefore, Yabe did not teach each and every element of the claim, and did not anticipate claim 1 as well.

Accordingly, Yabe did not anticipate claim 7 as a matter of law.

Customer No. : 31561
Application No.: 10/605,080
Docket No. : 11221-US-PA

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 8 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-3, 5-7 and 9-10 patently define over the prior art as well.

Customer No. : 31561
Application No.: 10/605,080
Docket No. : 11221-US-PA

CONCLUSION

The Applicant thanks for the allowance of claim 11. Further, for at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-3 and 5-10 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
JIANQ CHYUN IP OFFICE

Date : June 29, 2005

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee
Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw; usa@jcipgroup.com.tw